In support of our motion to dismiss, we request the Court take judicial notice of
five documents, the authenticity of which are beyond dispute. Three of these documents are
judicial filings that relate to the SEC's enforcement actions against John F. Gifford and Maxim
Integrated Products, Inc. ("Maxim" or the "Company") (Exhibits A-C to the Request for Judicial
Notice ("RJN")). The other two documents are press releases that relate to Maxim's future
restatement of earnings and the SEC's cases against Mr. Gifford and Maxim. (Exhibits D and E
to the RJN, respectively).
The SEC objects to the Court taking judicial notice of these documents,
contending that the documents are irrelevant to the allegations against Mr. Jasper and his motion

The SEC objects to the Court taking judicial notice of these documents, contending that the documents are irrelevant to the allegations against Mr. Jasper and his motion to dismiss. The SEC also suggests that some of these documents are not subject to judicial notice. Both arguments lack merit.

As an initial matter, the law is clear that all of these documents may be noticed by the district court at the dismissal stage. *See MGIC Indem. Corp. v. Weisman*, 803 F.2d 500, 504 (9th Cir. 1986) ("[o]n a motion to dismiss, we may take judicial notice of public record outside the pleadings"). First, district courts may take judicial notice of court filings from other cases. *See In re Silicon Graphics Sec. Litig.*, 183 F.3d 970, 984 n.14 (9th Cir. 1999) (taking judicial notice of five complaints from other cases); *U.S. ex rel. Robinson Rancheria Citizens Council v. Borneo, Inc.*, 971 F.2d 244, 248 (9th Cir. 1992) (taking judicial notice of a final judgment, finding that notice may be taken "of proceedings in other courts... if those proceedings have a direct relation to matters at issue") (citation omitted). Thus, Exhibits A, B, and C are properly noticeable by this Court. Second, courts may also take judicial notice of matters of public record, such as press releases and SEC filings. *See In re Turnstone Sys., Inc. Sec. Litig.*, 2003 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 26709, at *110 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 4, 2003) (taking judicial notice of news articles and press releases); *In re Calpine Corp. Sec. Litig.*, 288 F. Supp. 2d 1054, 1076 (N.D. Cal. 2003) (taking judicial notice of SEC filings); *In re Nuko Info. Sys. Sec. Litig.*, 199 F.R.D. 338, 341 (N.D. Cal. 2000) (same). Exhibits D and E are therefore also noticeable by this Court. Though

the SEC opposes the Court taking judicial notice of Exhibits A-E, it makes no effort square its position with the relevant authority.¹

Instead, the SEC asserts that the materials contained in Exhibits A-E are not related to its case against Mr. Jasper, and therefore not relevant to the motion to dismiss. *See* Pl.'s Obj. at 2-3. This position, however, is contradicted by the SEC's formal attempt to relate its cases against both Mr. Gifford and the Company to its case against Mr. Jasper. On December 7, 2007, the SEC filed an administrative motion requesting that its cases against Mr. Gifford and Maxim be related to its case against Mr. Jasper pursuant to Civil Local Rule 3-12. Civil Local Rule 3-12 permits cases to be related if they concern "substantially the same parties, property, transaction, or event."

Now, however, the SEC seeks to distance itself from this position, and argues that the court filings in those cases (and the related press release) are not relevant to our case and the motion to dismiss. But this argument ignores our criticism of the Amended Complaint. We moved to dismiss the Amended Complaint because of the SEC's failure to plead with particularity. In response, the SEC repeatedly alludes to the alleged role of Mr. Gifford in the alleged backdating of options. *See* Pl.'s Opp. at 1, 4, 6 (stating "Jasper was also aware that Maxim's CEO at times selected grant dates with hindsight"). But, as indicated in our motion to dismiss and reply, the SEC did not charge Mr. Gifford with any fraudulent conduct. We are left wondering with whom he is alleged to have conspired. *See* Jasper Reply in Support of Mot. to Dismiss at 6. The Court should take notice of these court filings and the related press release as they assist the Court with evaluating the specific allegations, and lack thereof, against Mr. Jasper.

Plaintiff repeatedly cites to *Branch v. Tunnell*, 14 F.3d 449, 453 (9th Cir. 1994) for the blanket statement that "the Court is limited generally to the allegations in the Complaint." *See* Pl.'s Obj. at 2-4. But this fails to account for any circumstances where judicial notice is appropriate. *See Lee v. City of Los Angeles*, 250 F.3d 668, 688-90 (9th Cir. 2001) (discussing the district court's ability to take notice of matters of public record under the Federal Rules of Evidence).

1	The January 17, 2008 press release concerning Maxim's restatement of earnings		
2	is also relevant to Plaintiff's allegations and Mr. Jasper's motion to dismiss. Plaintiff contends		
3	that Mr. Jasper conspired with others to backdate options and knowingly, or with recklessness,		
4	made false statements concerning the Company's financials. The January 17, 2008 press release,		
5	which was filed with the SEC, announced that Maxim will be restating earnings due to option		
6	accounting problems for a time period <i>before</i> Mr. Jasper was even an employee at the Company.		
7	Given the fact that the Company's option accounting problems evidently pre-date Mr. Jasper, the		
8	Court should consider this judicially noticeable fact in evaluating the allegations against him.		
9	Because Exhibits A-E are directly related to Plaintiff's allegations against Mr.		
10	Jasper, we respectfully request the Court take judicial notice of these five documents for		
11	purposes of scrutinizing the Complaint.		
12	2 Dated: March 17, 2008 Re	spectfully submitted,	
13	3 LA	ATHAM & WATKINS LLP Steven M. Bauer	
14	4	Robert E. Sims David M. Friedman	
15	5	Risha N. Jamison Christopher W. Johnstone	
16	6	Heather L. Thompson	
17	7 By	/S/	
18	8	Risha N. Jamison Attorneys for Defendant	
19	Carl W. Jasper		
20	0		
21			
22	2		
23	3		
24	4		
25	5		
26	6		
27	7		
28	8		